

## **REMARKS**

In the Office Action mailed December 11, 2008, the Office Action rejects claims 1-5, 7-13, and 19-28 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious in view of the combined teachings of U.S. Patent 4,704,322 of Roberts [herein “Roberts”] and U.S. Patent 5,792,713 of Scari, et al. [herein “Scari”]. The Office action further rejections claims 23-25 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

In response to the final Office Action mailed December 11, 2008, and having a period for response set to expire on March 11, 2009, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner amend the present application in the manner set forth in the above Amendment.

By the above Amendment, the Applicant requests that claims 1-13 and 19-28 be cancelled, without prejudice, and kindly requests the Examiner to enter new claims 29-46.

Support for new claim 29 may be found in Table III, paragraphs [0038], [0017].  
Support for new claims 30-31 may be found in paragraph [0019].  
Support for new claims 32-41 may be found in originally filed claims 4-13.  
Support for new claim 42 may be found in line of paragraph [0010].  
Support for new claim 43 may be found in lines 8-10 of paragraph [0014].  
Claims 44-46 include the claim features of cancelled claims 3 and 14-18.

Claims 14-18 were previously withdrawn. Upon entry of these amendments, Claims 29-46 will now be pending in this application.

Applicant submits that the Amendments place this application in condition for allowance by amending the claims in manners that are believed to render all pending claims allowable over the cited art. In view of the above requested amendments to the claims, Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action’s rejections of Claims 1-5, 7-13, and 19-28 under 35 U.S.C. §103 and §112, second paragraph, are moot. However, Applicant respectfully maintains its traverse of the §103 rejections of of Claims 1-5, 7-13, and 19-28 based on arguments previously submitted.

I. Response to §112, second paragraph, as indefinite

The Final Office Action rejects claims 23-25 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as indefinite. Upon entry of the amendments herein, claims 23-25 have been cancelled. Applicant respectfully acknowledges the Office Actions withdrawal of this rejection in the Advisory Action mailed on February 26, 2009.

II. Response to Obviousness Rejection Based upon Roberts and Scari

The Final Office Action rejects claims 1-5, 7-13, and 19-28 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious in view of the combined teachings of U.S. Patent 4,704,322 of Roberts [herein “Roberts”] and U.S. Patent 5,792,713 of Scari, et al. [herein “Scari”]. In view of the above amendments, claims 1-5, 7-13 and 19-28 have been cancelled. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the aforementioned rejection is rendered moot.

Upon entry of these amendments, Claims 29-46 will now be pending in this application. Additionally, submitted herewith is a Section 1.132 Declaration of Jonathon Roberts, in which it is declared that the inventors surprisingly found unexpected results in that the combination of a mica layer and twist-free glass fiber provide substantially and unpredictably improved electrical insulating performance as compared to standard mica tape insulation materials. In addition to the detailed results submitted in the Roberts Declaration, these improvements are also illustrated in Table III of the specification which provides comparative data showing that the dissipation factor (under “Experimental), i.e. a claimed feature, is markedly lower (specifically, 67.6 % lower) than standard mica tape (under “Control 2”), as well as paragraphs [0038] and [0017]. In view of the amendments and evidence submitted herewith, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 29-46 are in condition for allowance.

III. Response to Obviousness Rejection Based upon Roberts, Scari, and Andres

The Office Action rejected claim 6 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious in view of the combined teachings of Roberts, Scari, and U.S. Patent 4,34,153 of Andres et al. [herein “Andres”]. The Final Office Action rejects claim 6 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of the combined teachings of Roberts, Scari, and U.S. Patent 4,34,153 of Andres et al. [herein

“Andres”]. In view of the above amendments, claim 6 has been cancelled. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the aforementioned rejection is rendered moot.

III. CONCLUSION

The Applicant believes that the above Amendments, §1.132 Declaration and Remarks place the application in allowable form. An early and favorable action on the merits of the application is requested.

If a telephone conference would be of assistance in advancing prosecution of the subject application, the Applicant’s undersigned invites the Examiner to telephone her at the number provided.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Alana M. Fuierer  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 51,709

Dated: March 11, 2009

**HESLIN ROTHENBERG FARLEY & MESITI P.C.**

5 Columbia Circle  
Albany, New York 12203-5160  
Telephone: (518) 452-5600  
Facsimile: (518) 452-5579